



#16  
12/31/02  
B

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re PATENT APPLICATION OF

MANGOLD, et al

Appln. No.: 09/632,208

Filed: August 3, 2000

Title: SINTERED MATERIALS

Confirmation No.:

Group Art Unit: 1755

Examiner: Group, Karl E.

December 26, 2002

\* \* \* \* \*

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
DEC 30 2002  
TC 1700

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated August 28, 2002, please reconsider the final rejection for the following reasons

REMARKS

Withdrawal of the final rejection and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 3-22 remain pending (in this regard, the Disposition of Claims at items 4 and 4a of the Office Action Summary, incorrectly identify the pending claims) but are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-8 and 23-24 are examined and rejected.

Reconsideration of the rejection, under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, with respect to claim 8, is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 8 is not indefinite. The subject matter of claim 8 is not temporal in scope as asserted. Claim 8 refers to a comparison between a sintered material comprising a glass according to an embodiment of the present invention and a glass "having an identical composition" produced via a conventional melting process. One skilled in the art would recognize that Applicants, by reference to "conventional" melting process, are referring to such process as exists at the time the application was filed and not some future developed technology which would not then be "conventional" or known at the time of Applicants' invention.